

Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1201). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. S. 1750. An act to strengthen the Federal Firearms Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1202). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 558. An act to amend the acts of March 3, 1901, and June 28, 1944, so as to exempt the District of Columbia, from paying fees in any of the courts of the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1204). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 564. An act to provide for apportioning the expense of maintaining and operating the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge over the Potomac River from Jones Point, Va., to Maryland; without amendment (Rept. No. 1205). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1291. An act to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, to increase the fee charged for learners' permits; without amendment (Rept. No. 1206). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 2397. An act authorizing the National Capital Transportation Agency to carry out part 1 of its transit development program and to further the objectives of the act approved July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 537); without amendment (Rept. No. 1207). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5393. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 1208). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee of conference. H.R. 4998. A bill to assist in expanding and improving community facilities and services for the health care of aged and other persons, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1209). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the

Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 158. An act to confer upon the domestic relations branch of the municipal court for the District of Columbia jurisdiction to hear and determine the petition for adoption filed by Marie Talliaferro; without amendment (Rept. No. 1203). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 9273. A bill to repeal obsolete laws relating to military bounty land warrants and to provide for cancellation of recorded warrants; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GRANT:

H.R. 9274. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage and assist the several States in carrying on a program of forestry research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LAIRD (by request):

H.R. 9275. A bill to donate to the Stockbridge-Munsee community some submarginal lands of the United States, and to make such lands parts of the reservation involved; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 9276. A bill to authorize the naming of the reservoir to be created by the Little Goose lock and dam, Snake River, Wash., in honor of the late Dr. Enoch A. Bryan; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 9277. A bill to place certain limitations on the authority of the Federal Communications Commission to delete previously assigned very high frequency television channels, to give the Commission certain regulatory authority over television receiving apparatus, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 9278. A bill to provide a government for the Trust Territory of Micronesia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 9279. A bill to deny the use of the U.S. postal service for the carriage of Communist political propaganda; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 9280. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 9281. A bill to deny the use of the U.S. postal service for the carriage of Communist political propaganda; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H.R. 9282. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act as reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURKE of Kentucky:

H.J. Res. 579. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. Res. 469. Resolution providing, that the Federal Communications Commission should not adopt any action requiring present very-high-frequency television stations to change its operation to any channel other than another of the present channels; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 9283. A bill for the relief of Tomasso DiGloia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 9284. A bill for the relief of Kazimierz Brzeski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 9285. A bill for the relief of Helenita K. Stephenson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 9286. A bill for the relief of Yung Chul Kang, his wife, Bok Nam Suh Kang, and their minor daughter, U Ri Hang Kang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 9287. A bill for the relief of Maria Mereghetti (Mother Benedetta); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9288. A bill for the relief of Annunziata Colombo (Mother Cherubina); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 9289. A bill for the relief of Herbert Thomas King, his wife, Si-Ling Chang King; and his stepdaughter, Hsiao-ling King; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Service on the Appropriations Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I am serving my 19th year on the Appropriations Committee. Believe me, service on the committee is quite an experience.

We hold hearings from 10 each morning until 5 o'clock in the afternoon, with an hour off at lunch—practically every day of the session. We attend to our

other duties before and after, and by interruption.

Many of our constituents write us to obtain appropriations for public works projects and many other programs and, in the same mail, write us not to appropriate money.

Even our colleagues come before our committee, ask for appropriations in huge sums, and some frequently file a carbon copy of their statement with the committee, send the original to the press; then if we appropriate the money a news release is issued as to what appropriations our friend got and, of course, anything not obtained was the fault of that "old Appropriations Committee." All of this is OK, of course, under the rules of the political game.

After all, those of us on the committee are no different. We, too, like to provide for those things in which we believe, especially when our people agree with us.

Actually, sometimes the inconsistencies are lots of fun to watch. A few years ago the Denver Post berated the committee for refusing to appropriate \$2 million to eradicate bark beetles which plague that area—and in the same paper severely criticized the Appropriations Committee for "spending the Nation's money far too liberally."

I wrote the editor that while most people were for saving money, every section had its "bark beetles" and when you added up the cost of meeting all of them the total greatly exceeded the national income.

Incidentally, when the justification for these funds was later based on protecting the watershed, instead of the almost valueless timber, funds were appropriated.

In my own area, perhaps the best example came when I made the successful motion to override the President's veto of the Public Works appropriation bill in 1959. Most of the leadership of both parties were opposed to my motion, though for different reasons. After standing up to about a 2-hour fight within the Appropriations Committee, my motion to override the veto carried by a vote of 19 to 17. The Greenville Harbor project was saved; so were the Pascagoula and Memphis projects, along with about 60 other new starts.

When the House approved the action, the press carried smiling pictures of those leaders who had opposed my motion; and in the areas where I hoped for big headlines about my successful efforts, the press stressed the fact that in saving these projects funds for many other continuing projects had been slightly reduced, listing by name those which were reduced.

With all of that, I would not trade my place on the Appropriations Committee—where we take some beatings and where money is often appropriated for programs in which I do not believe—for any in the Congress. My membership on the committee which controls the purse strings means I am in the middle of the show and have a real opportunity for service. Certainly, my membership on this committee has contributed greatly in my own State to the Boll Weevil Laboratory, the Poultry Laboratory, the Soils Laboratory, the many flood control and watershed projects, soil conservation, REA, Extension and 4-H Club programs, the Greenville and Pascagoula Harbor projects, the Agricultural Conservation Program, and many others which I have been able to promote.

It may be that it is the President who makes appointments within the limits of the civil service law; it is the Congress, however, which makes appropriations and says what the money shall be used for.

I know my long-time membership on the Appropriations Committee has enabled me to help keep up our investment in our own country—before others give everything away in foreign aid. After all, our own country is the base on which all these other commitments must depend.

This year I am proud to say we provided increased funds for watershed protection and flood prevention, for domestic public works—including \$70,725,100 in funds for the lower Mississippi, increased funds for the Big Sunflower, provided for additional surveys, increased funds for other Mississippi projects and kept work on harbor development going forward.

Whoever may get the credit, this investment in the development and protection of our country is absolutely sound. We must put our own country first.

Resolution on VHF

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution pointing out the value to rural and farm families of the very high frequency television channels—channels 2-13—through the wide-area service they deliver.

I have asked that no action be taken by the Federal Communications Commission to require any VHF facility to change to the ultra high band, and, thereby, deprive farm and rural families of high quality dependable service. In the State of Alabama many thousand rural and farm families in central and south Alabama would be deprived of all television service if the FCC requires Channel 12 in Montgomery to change from VHF to UHF. There would be far more deprived of information from the State Capital if this action were taken.

I have introduced this resolution in the sincere hope that more careful consideration can be given this measure and so that the Commission, in light of protests from central and south Alabama, will abandon its proposed intent to deprive the citizens of our State of their use of channel 12.

This resolution suggests that the Federal Communications Commission not take any action at this time until they have a chance to hear the results of the UHF experiments in New York for which the Congress authorized \$2 million. And as a Member of Congress from a rural district, I oppose the Commission's taking this television service away from the farm families.

Educational and Cultural Exchange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, with events in countries all over the world becoming more and more serious, it is vital that we make use of every possible means to give a favorable impression of ourselves to all other nations of the globe. Every citizen of the United States has an obligation to see that the 50,000 foreign students visiting America have a correct understanding of our country and our ways. We cannot afford to allow these students to leave the United States with wrong or biased viewpoints. It is vital, therefore, that we create a dynamic program to make sure that these students have a favorable impression of the people and policies of the United States.

Recently a study was made of 500 foreign students attending the University of Pennsylvania as a means of learn-

ing their experiences in the United States, as well as their impressions of our country. Though this study was limited to students at Penn, the authors, John F. Melby and Elinor K. Wolf, indicated that problems faced by this institution are closely related to the problems the Nation's schools face as a whole. This study brought out several specific problems which need to be exposed. It is my belief that the Federal Government must supply the initiative if we are to meet and realistically solve these problems.

First of all, the orientation program which the foreign student receives, if any, is not equipped to be the helpful program it should be. This need is especially critical when the foreign student first arrives in the country. When the student's mind is most likely to be open to all points of view, we fail miserably. This is the time when the student should be told that all Americans do not drive convertibles; that all Americans do not live in a sprawling ranch house; and that all Americans do not live by the creed of equal rights for all. Unfortunately, the student is left to find out himself. Of the 500 students at Penn, only 25 percent had any kind of orientation course, and of this group only 7 persons had an extended course over several weeks, which has proved to be the most successful type. Thirty-five percent of the group had never even known that such a course existed. The remaining part of the group pleaded lack of time or felt no need for such a course. The report stated:

It is clear, however, that a great majority of students wanted and would have profited from the right kind of course as indicated by their own statements.

Had the money been available a much larger orientation program would have been conducted for the foreign students.

Secondly, it is pleasing to note that, except for a language problem in English, the foreign student does acceptable academic work. It is vital, however, that the student have a working knowledge of English if he is to succeed in his college work. Almost invariably the study points out a relationship between poor grades and poor English. In addition, the problem is further complicated by the fact that most of the students believe that they have a good understanding of English. Consequently, many students are not aware of their English deficiencies until it is too late. Thus, it is extremely important that we have a plan that can cope with these needs. If we are able to enact a program along these lines, we will be doing much to alleviate this problem. It is quite necessary that additional English courses be sponsored so that all foreign students will have an equal chance to be successful in their work. It can certainly be assumed that those with the greatest ability in English will have the best chance to understand the ideas and customs of our country.

Thirdly, we must enact some kind of program to aid the foreign student in finding adequate housing. Because of overcrowded dormitory conditions, 80 percent of the students were forced to seek shelter off campus. The study

describes the student as being hungry, confused, and on the verge of panic because he did not know how he was to be housed. An article in the New York Times which appeared on June 3, 1961, describes the dilemma faced by the foreign student in the area of housing. When the student is able to find housing, it is usually in subpar neighborhoods. I might add that only 27 percent found their accommodations through the university; the rest located their living places through various means. Mr. Speaker, under these circumstances, it is completely illogical to expect the foreign student, a guest of our country, to gain a favorable viewpoint of the wealthier and most advanced Nation in the world. If anything, under present conditions, seeds of hate will begin to grow within the student from the moment he arrives.

Fourthly, the study indicates that many foreign students are unable to see many of our cultural sights, because of the great cost involved. Specifically, 80 percent of the students wanted to see more works in music, the theater, and the arts, but were unable to do so because of financial difficulties. It is vital for these young men and women to see more than just a college campus while in the United States. It is paramount that we make sure these students see our historic shrines, our theaters, galleries, our movies, in other words our American way of life. We are on trial before these ambassadors from all over the world. It is important that the facts are presented before them, so that they can make a fair and objective decision. Let no foreign student be able to say that he was confused and uncertain about the United States, because he saw too little of it.

There are many ways we can seek out and attack this problem if we so desire. We could form contracts with theaters, whereby the Federal Government would pay for part of the admission. We could supplement college programs already providing such a service though on a far too limited scale. We could set up summer employment programs so that the students could pay the costs themselves. I might add that in the study 40 percent of the students were unable to find jobs when they applied. Indeed the problem is not in helping these students; it is to make ourselves interested enough to provide the means we already have to supply the help. When 78 percent of the students said they would be willing to take an extra course, completely unrelated to their regular course, on some aspect of American life, we need not fear whether they are interested.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, and most important of all, the foreign student has many confusing and conflicting ideas on American policy. A lack of general knowledge on the official policy in such controversial areas as race relations, business activities, capitalism versus socialism, and foreign affairs is a source of much concern to the foreign student. It is here that we must concentrate our most diligent efforts to correct this situation. We have a tremendous opportunity to present our side of the picture to the world. Moreover, we must not forget

that every student when he returns to his native land will fan out his impressions of the United States to hundreds of his fellow countrymen. We cannot afford to allow one of these students to distribute ill feelings about the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to mislead my colleagues. I am not advocating a huge Federal agency to solve this problem; that is wholly unnecessary. All that is needed to relieve this unsatisfactory situation is to supplement with Federal funds the programs already in existence in colleges and community centers, and make sure that these programs are effective. In a day and age when we speak of billions in foreign aid, we can certainly afford to allocate a minimum amount of money to further the true image of America.

Since the conference report on the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 has been approved, the administration and Members of Congress can seriously consider the suggestions contained in this statement.

The Right to Equality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by the Honorable JACOB JAVITS, of New York, which appeared in the September 1961 issue of the magazine *Americas*:

THE RIGHT TO EQUALITY

(Article by JACOB K. JAVITS in the September 1961 issue of the magazine "Americas")

(JACOB K. JAVITS has been a U.S. Senator since 1956. He previously served four terms in the U.S. House of Representatives and 2 years as New York State Attorney General. He has consistently championed civil rights programs, sponsoring and serving as a floor leader for much of the recent legislation in this field.)

The struggle against the remaining racial and religious discrimination in the United States engaged my interest and action long before I entered public life. I cannot emphasize too strongly the primary importance of this struggle to the tranquility of our country and its moral leadership of the free world. Patience and determination are basic qualities for success, law is the necessary equipment, but most essential of all is the support of a well-informed public opinion. This book is my contribution to the effort to provide information and to stimulate discussion and study of one of the major issues of our time.

I was born in 1904, and I remember vividly my life as a small boy, the son of Jewish immigrants, in a janitor's flat on Orchard and Stanton Streets on the lower East Side of New York City. My father made pants and doubled as janitor of the tenement, then later worked full time as the janitor for \$30 a month, plus rooms. My mother sold crockery and dry goods from a pushcart. In school I read about democracy and about the equality of all in America, but to a poor Jewish boy, running errands for a candy

shop, scratching for a penny, watching my father get out the vote for \$2 a head paid by a saloonkeeper who was a Tammany Hall captain, the words "democracy" and "equality" seemed just so many distant, high-sounding phrases. I had little thought that I could win social acceptance, not to speak of being permitted to serve in the high public offices of Congressman, attorney general of New York State, and U.S. Senator.

My own experience is symptomatic of the social revolution which has marked American life since the turn of the 20th century. The United States of the early 1900's was a "white, Protestant, Anglo-Saxon" country, as people used to say. Millions of citizens were not white or Protestant or "Anglo-Saxon" (meaning descended from western European stock), but the dominant assumption was that they should be satisfied with the skimpy educations, the dirtier jobs, and a severely limited right to advance in the economic or political world. In 1900 the top-ranking colleges admitted only a handful of students from minority families, and most of these came from decidedly exceptional circumstances. It was difficult for a Catholic of Irish or southern European background, and still harder for an eastern European Jew, to rise high in the basic industries, in the professions, or in the realm of arts and letters. No realistic person would have thought of proposing anyone but an old-stock white Protestant for the Presidency or the Vice Presidency of the United States. As for the average Negro, in either the North or the South, he was lucky to find a livelihood that kept him in ramshackle housing and grubby food.

During the decades after World War I, the United States went on chipping away at the crust of caste. There were years when the Nation seemed to turn backward, but overall it headed toward the elimination of discrimination on the basis of race, creed, or color.

By the late 1950's, the highest prestige colleges were competing with each other to enroll outstanding students regardless of family background. More miles of trim suburbia were stretching out, now inhabited not only by the old-stock executive group but by the middle-class and working-class sons of immigrants. The only Federal civil rights law since Reconstruction days was passed in 1957, and was followed 3 years later by further civil rights legislation. In one area of U.S. life after another, Negroes scored more firsts. A particularly striking event occurred in 1958. For decades the top echelon of the U.S. diplomatic service had been considered a special preserve of the well born. On January 23, 1958, President Eisenhower appointed Clifton R. Wharton Minister to Rumania, the first Negro to be named U.S. chief of mission to a country of predominantly white population.

All the while, the 1954 Supreme Court decision ordering the end of the color line in public schools was doing its work. Desegregation was resisted by efforts ranging from the portentous to the ridiculous. In Arkansas, Gov. Orval Faubus so brazenly defied the Supreme Court that President Eisenhower ordered Federal troops into Little Rock. In Florida, Henry Balch, columnist for the Orlando Sentinel, thundered that a children's book telling about the marriage of a white and a black rabbit was a plot of the "integrating desegregationists," and hounded the volume off the shelves of the public libraries. (The author, Garth Williams, mused sadly: "It was written for children from 2 to 5 who will understand it perfectly. It was not written for adults, who will not understand it because it is only about a soft furry love and has no hidden message of hate.") Under the circumstances, desegregation moved ahead slowly. In 1960, on the anniversary of the Court decision, the statistics showed that only 6 percent of the Negro

students in the southern and border States were attending integrated schools—and the percentage was zero in Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina. Yet, whatever the rate of speed, whatever the obstacles, the Nation was going ahead desegregating its schools.

Today, I am confident, the United States is entering a period when the walls of discrimination will go on tumbling—and being tumbled—down. The election of a Catholic to the presidency is already a fact. By the year 2000, it is conceivable that we may see the election of a Negro to the Presidency or the Vice Presidency. The appointment of a Negro Secretary of State does not seem far-fetched when a man like Ralph Bunche is considered. A former Assistant Secretary of State, this distinguished American Negro is second only to Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld at the United Nations; he has, and has richly earned, an international reputation as a peace negotiator and statesman. Negro leaders have told me that they feel it will be politically feasible to name a Negro to the Supreme Court within the next 10 years.

In the proximate future we may well see a marked increase in the number of Negroes in Congress. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, spurred on by the passage of the Civil Rights acts of 1957 and 1960, has launched a drive to triple Negro registration in the South and thus to put it on a par with the present 60 percent registration of eligible white voters. I believe that the number in the House of Representatives is likely to grow steadily, and that, from the Negro 10 percent of our population, between 30 and 40 qualified persons may be elected as Representatives to the 106th Congress by the year 2,000. Long before then, I expect to see the first Negro since the Reconstruction era taking his place in the U.S. Senate.

By 1965, public school integration should be well on its way even in the Deep South. The next two Congresses, those which convene in 1961 and 1963, will probably bring an end to the archaic Senate rule XXII and therefore to the filibuster, which has been the special and stubborn hurdle on the road to civil rights legislation. I make this prediction on the strength of my own experience in the Senate and on the basis of my observation of the mood of the country during the civil rights debates of 1957 and 1960. There is a new generation in the United States—and of those who live below the Mason-Dixon line. Today the South is producing an ever increasing number of enlightened citizens who, while still opposed to general civil rights legislation, do not carry over the ancient southern opposition, indeed revulsion, to the idea of accepting Negroes as the equals of whites in public affairs. For example, during the civil rights discussions of recent years, a notable number of southern leaders conceded that the full enjoyment of the ballot belongs to the Negro as well as to the white man.

If the country's past argues for a continuing social upsurge, the country's present certainly does not gainsay it. The Negro group, latest of the groups to make its bid for equal rights and equal opportunities, is certain to increase in political power and certain to use that power to win more opportunities. Since 1950, it has been estimated, the potential nonwhite vote has catapulted 25 percent in New York, 50 percent in Chicago, 62 percent in Los Angeles. By the year 2,000, one out of every three voters in New York and Chicago, and one out of two voters in Los Angeles, may well be nonwhite. Population shifts of minority groups to urban areas are creating a tide that could elect a nonwhite mayor in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, or Los Angeles, before many years. In the South, as a result of the civil rights legislation already passed

and the additional laws that are almost certain to come, the Negro will vote more and more. And, as all American groups have done, he will use the vote to broaden opportunities for himself.

Outside the South, the antidiscrimination forces can count on a hard reality of modern U.S. life; prejudice has proved to be ineffective politics. In the past, bigotry and hate may have had some success, but today they simply do not work. In my own career in politics, I have had no little experience with religious smear campaigns. In the late part of the senatorial campaign in 1956, literature appeared in New York City—which has a large Jewish population—carrying the innuendo that I had forsaken the Jewish faith. The matter was brought out into the open during a television interview when viewers telephoned in the question: "Is it true that you changed your Jewish faith?" Questions such as this, as every public figure knows, are like that old verbal trap which calls for a yes or no answer to the question: "Have you stopped beating your wife yet?" Air time ran out before I could reply that I had not changed my religion. Yet, according to my analysis of the 1956 results, the question had little or no effect on the voters of New York State.

The most spectacular proof that appeals to religious prejudice do not work in modern U.S. politics came in the West Virginia presidential primary battle in 1960 between Senator John Kennedy, a Catholic, and Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, a Protestant. Although Senator HUMPHREY made it ringingly plain that he wanted no votes gained from religious bias, anti-Catholicism was a blatant part of the campaign. Seasoned observers thought the prejudice might well have a decisive effect: West Virginia is 95 percent Protestant and was supposed to have a strong anti-Catholic tradition. But when the votes were counted, Kennedy had won a thumping three-to-two victory. He was hurt little or not at all by the anti-Catholic campaign. On the contrary, apparently he was actually helped by it. Heavily Protestant West Virginia seemed the more determined to give the Senator, a Catholic, a victory as a way of showing that it wanted no part of elections determined by irrelevant questions of religion.

There are approximately 18 million Negroes in the United States, one-half of whom live in the South, and another third in five urban centers in the North. Statistics offer a dramatic picture of how meagerly they share in our expanding economy. In 1939, the median income for white workers was \$1,112 a year; for nonwhite workers, it was \$460. In 1955, white workers had a median income of \$3,986, contrasted with \$2,342 for nonwhite workers. These figures make plain that while the nonwhite population has shared in our general prosperity and reduced the difference between incomes, the Negro nevertheless continues to pay a severe price solely because of the color of his skin. Today, two out of every five Negro families earn less than \$2,000 a year. Average Negro incomes are still far below white incomes.

There is a final fact about the results of discrimination, the most important of all. The future of our Nation—indeed, its very existence—may well depend upon whether nonwhites living in the underdeveloped countries choose communism or freedom. The great contest revolves around the 1,200 million people—largely Negro and oriental—who live in the Far East, the Middle East, and Africa. This global picture is crucially related to our domestic struggle over civil rights and the ending of discrimination. It is so importantly related because the nonwhites are watching closely to see whether we practice what we preach about equality and justice.

No U.S. domestic situation gives the Soviet Union and the international Com-

munist Party more fuel for their propaganda machines than our two faces on civil rights. In terms of world prestige, Little Rock cost us more in 1 day of violent prejudice than the launching of all the Russian space satellites.

Even more damaging to our prestige was the reaction of the press in the uncommitted areas of Asia, the Middle East, and Africa. Typically, the Times of Indonesia declared: "It is hard to realize that this is taking place in a country proclaiming its democratic liberties for all to hear." We simply cannot hope to win the nonwhite peoples of the world conclusively to our side if they doubt that we will consider them equals. They will continue to doubt just as long as we wave our Constitution at them with one hand, and with the other tolerate the denial to a substantial part of our citizens in a broad region of our own country of their rights under the Constitution.

As the United States hurries along the road toward genuine democracy, all kinds of efforts will help. The agitation of organizations will have its importance; so, too, will the labors of dedicated individuals and the studies of psychologists, sociologists, economists, and historians. But the prime need is law—more firm, carefully formulated legislation on the Federal, State, and municipal levels directed toward making equal rights and equal opportunities ultimate realities. Law is the indispensable advance guard of social change. It gives well-intentioned men a standard to which they can repair. It nudges the indifferent and it tames the hostile.

In this connection, too little attention has been paid to the fact that the Federal Government now spends more than \$30 billion a year on contracts with private firms. This means that hundreds of thousands of jobs are placed where the Government has the power—indeed, the responsibility—to see that they are filled without regard to religion or color, but the Congress has to help. In 1953, by Executive order, President Eisenhower established the Federal Committee on Government Contracts, the main purpose of which is to combat discriminatory practices in industries fulfilling Government contracts. The Committee has done some good work, but it is hampered by inadequate funds and staff and especially by the fact that it does not have the authority of an institution established by Congress. (Since 1953, it has investigated only 837 complaints, and settled to its satisfaction only 245.)

In 1959, as part of his package civil rights proposals, President Eisenhower recommended the establishment of a statutory Federal Commission on Equal Opportunity Under Government Contracts. New York State pioneered in this field with the formation of the State commission against discrimination. This agency's experience and its success fully justify the President's recommendation. The Eisenhower proposal was lost in the Senate compromises, but its ultimate enactment is of prime importance.

Action is needed to bring, in all 50 States, the enactment of legislation already existing in 5 States, which forbids discrimination in any housing aided by federally guaranteed mortgages under the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) or the Veterans' Administration (VA). The existing State laws authorize agencies or commissions to deal with discrimination on a basis of conciliation and mediation and, if these fail, by civil action in the courts. But a big share of the responsibility for driving Jim Crow out of the housing field must be assumed by the Federal Government—and it could do a great deal more than it is presently attempting. It should be fundamental Federal policy for all agencies connected with housing to push vigorously for equal opportunity to a decent home. Every effort should be made—particularly every administrative effort—to

bring about compliance by builders who seek the aid of FHA and VA mortgages. The urban renewal program shows that this can be done.

Those of us who live in States like New York, where public sentiment and every responsible governmental agency are on record against any inequality of opportunity, have a special responsibility to practice, and practice in highly positive terms, what we preach. If southern segregationists are to be deprived of their most cherished distortion—that racial or religious discrimination which persists in the North gives a license for Jim Crowism in the South—then none among us can be a mere bystander in the fight.

It is a fight filled with its ups and downs, its nagging complexities, its shocking desertions, as I am only too well aware from my years in public office. It is also a fight peculiarly appropriate to the only nation in all of man's long history that ever dared mix so many different races, nationalities, and religions, and, having mixed them, dared to declare that the end product could be equal rights and equal opportunity for all. That the people of the United States have the desire, the strength, and the faith to go on pushing toward this goal has been said many times, but it was once said in a way that carries its special force over all the intervening decades. In 1880, U.S. Senator B. K. Bruce rose to support a pending bill. His remarks moved to the subject of the general meaning of the country's experience, and he said: "As a people, our history is full of surmounted obstacles. We have been scaling difficult problems for more than 100 years. We have been (and will continue to be) settling material, moral, and great political questions that before our era had been unsolved."

B. K. Bruce was a Negro, born into human slavery, elected to the U.S. Senate from Mississippi amid all the anti-Negro bitterness and violence of Reconstruction days. His speech was in support of a bill protecting the civil rights and extending the opportunities of the American Indian.

Many predict that racial tensions in the United States will get worse before they get better. I am well aware of these predictions and of the possibility that they could be correct, but I still have great faith in the resourceful genius of our country. When public indignation is raised here there is no denying relief. To save ourselves—and do it just in time—there must be those who will not permit themselves to be still and compliant or permit their fellow-citizens to be complacent in the face of the incendiary injustices of discrimination and segregation which persist in our society.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Newsletter of September 16, 1961:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

As adjournment nears, Congress adopted the usual procedure of pushing through, in record time, a backlog of critical legislation. This is not good government. There is dan-

ger of passing legislation without adequate debate and careful consideration. This 1st session of the 87th Congress has been marked by an unusual lack of direction and purpose. The House has met only eight Fridays since January. This week marks the first Saturday session. The Rules Committee fight held up the organization of committee assignments for weeks. The Federal fiscal year ended June 30 and here, at the middle of September, Congress has not yet cleared all the appropriation bills. Then on one day (Wednesday of this week) the House took the following action: (and this is only a partial list of Wednesday's business) approved the conference reports on military construction appropriations; State, Justice and Judiciary appropriations; Atomic Energy Commission appropriations; Federal Assistance to Airports Act; amending the Immigration and Nationality Act regarding alien orphans; expand and extend the saline water conversion program, and others. In addition the House passed a Public Works appropriation bill in the amount of \$3,662,548,500 and carrying increased public power projects, amended the Universal Military Training and Service Act, granted additional authority to the Export-Import Bank, amended the Ship Mortgage Act of 1920, and on Wednesday and Thursday debated and approved the Peace Corps. Responsible government calls for responsible leadership in Congress and the orderly conduct of the peoples' business.

One victory was chalked up for the advocates of free enterprise. For the third time the House refused to approve appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission to operate the Hanford atomic energy project for the production of public power. The Senate amendment to include the public power facility was rejected 251 to 155. I voted against it.

The fight on the Public Works Appropriation bill was marked by efforts to expand public power facilities. An attempt to reduce funds for the Upper Colorado River basin and eliminate construction of transmission lines for the development of public power was defeated, 224 to 182. I voted to reduce the funds and eliminate the transmission lines. On final passage I opposed the whole bill. This is no time to be spending millions on public works projects when it is necessary to spend so much on military preparedness to meet the Communist plans for aggression.

Most ill-advised action of the week was approval of the Peace Corps (H.R. 7500) with a budget of \$40 million for fiscal 1962. Two very disturbing elements in connection with this bill (1) the absence of guidelines for carrying out the purpose of the legislation and (2) in the 50-page bill Presidential power is outlined in 63 instances. This unlimited power given to the Executive is further depletion of the constitutional authority of Congress and moves us just a little closer to dictatorship (all decisions and actions controlled by one man). Example—on just one page the bill provides "That the President may waive, such provisions of the act as he determines to be necessary (including provision for loyalty oath) the service of a volunteer may be terminated at the pleasure of the President * * * the President may enroll in the Peace Corps * * * volunteer leaders." Additional startling examples of delegations of power: "The President is authorized to carry out programs in furtherance of the purpose of this Act, on such terms and conditions as he may determine * * *. The President may exercise any functions vested in him by this Act through such agency or officers of the U.S. Government as he shall direct * * *. The President shall prescribe appropriate procedures to assure coordination of Peace Corps activities * * *. The President may enroll * * * qualified citizens * * * under terms and conditions * * * which the Presi-

dent may prescribe * * * volunteers shall be provided with such living, travel, and leave allowances, and such housing, transportation, supplies, equipment, subsistence, and clothing, as the President may determine to be necessary," and so on and on and on. Congressman Gross (Iowa) summed up arguments against the bill eloquently: "We have before us today a shining example of that for which Congress is becoming notorious—legislative approval of a pig in a poke * * * this latest international gimmick was spawned some 15 months ago on the basis of a \$10,000 appropriation for a study of the feasibility of establishing a Youth Corps * * * today, this latest international boondoggle, without benefit of permanent legislation, without congressional scrutiny of program or plan, has already spent and initiated projects costing some \$17,500,000."

The Peace Corps was approved, 287 to 97. In my opinion, we may regret the action. The project was too hastily planned, without adequate study, gives far too much power to the President, and no provision is made for adequately training and equipping personnel for the awesome responsibility we are asking them to assume.

In spite of my efforts to include funds for the Dallas Federal Building (approved by Public Works Committee—newsletter August 12, 1961) in the deficiency appropriation bill, the House leadership failed to do so. I will do all possible to have the funds put into the regular appropriation bill next year.

Dedicatory Address by Representative Hemphill, of South Carolina, at National Guard Armory, Clover, S.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address entitled "Citizen-Soldier: Backbone of the Nation's Strength" delivered by Congressman ROBERT W. HEMPHILL of the Fifth South Carolina Congressional District at the dedication of the National Guard Armory at Clover, S.C., September 10, 1961, 3 p.m.

Congressman HEMPHILL in this address has given relevant and informative information concerning the role of the citizen soldier in the defense of this country through the history of this Nation. He portrayed the important part the members of the militia, the National Guard and the Reserve have played in the defense of our Nation. The distinguished Congressman from the Fifth District is to be commended for this splendid address, and I hope as many people as possible will take occasion to read it.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITIZEN-SOLDIER: BACKBONE OF THE NATION'S STRENGTH

Maj. Gen. Pinckney, Maj. Gen. Godfrey, Colonel Harvey, Captain Murphy, distinguished platform guests, members of the Clover, S.C., National Guard unit, ladies and

gentlemen, here today, in the shadow of Kings Mountain, we cannot but feel excitement and pride that our heritage is so great, our obligation to the citizen-soldiers of the Revolution so strong, and our purpose so patriotic that we meet here today to carry on for those who died on yonder hills that we might be free. Gathered among us, I am sure, are the spirits of those brave men of another day, and if we were not true to those of our heritage, how fruitless would be our efforts, how empty our ceremony, and how disgustingly shallow our accomplishments: We, too, should use the gifts we have been given for the preservation of freedom.

And now let us turn to the business of the day.

This army is more than a building of cold, hard stone. It is a living thing. It symbolizes the determination of all of you here as well as the determination of the American people, to sacrifice their time, their fortunes, and even their lives in the struggle for freedom. We arm for liberty, not tyranny. That we have always built our forces on the citizen-soldier stands as testimony of our deep and profound love for peace, order, and freedom. The National Guard is the instrument of the citizen-soldier—and a mighty weapon it has been in our Nation's history.

You will remember that the fight for independence against British colonial domination was carried forward by the militiamen of the 13 colonies. These were the now famous minutemen who have been justly heralded in every American history book. They fought bravely and honorably for American independence. Without their efforts, we still might be under the power of foreign influences. They shed their blood at Saratoga, at Concord, and at Lexington. They also fought and died in the swamps of Georgia and the woods of the Carolinas. They were hardy men, providing us with an example which we can well follow. This army is built and is dedicated in the spirit of these militiamen—the forerunners of the National Guard.

No less a person than Gen. George Washington, the father of our country, paid tribute to the indispensable role which the militia played in the Revolutionary War. It was largely through his untiring work that a well-regulated militia was made the basis for the Nation's national defense. In his "Sentiments on a Peace Establishment," Washington wrote: "It may be laid down as a primary position, and the basis of our system that every citizen who enjoys the protection of a free government, owed not only a proportion of his property, but even of his personal services to the defense of it, and consequently the citizens of America, from 18 to 50 years of age, should be borne on the militia rolls, provided with uniform arms, and so far accustomed to the use of them, that the total strength of the country might be called forth at short notice.

Following Washington's suggestion, Congress passed the Militia Act of 1792. It laid the basis for a truly national militia system that was to endure for over a hundred years until the passage of the Dick Act of 1903. Each State was empowered to enroll every free, able-bodied male citizen between the ages of 18 and 45 years into a State militia which was to be ready to serve in times of State or national emergency.

This was wise legislation. It provided the framework through which the States and the Nation could muster sufficient military manpower to cope with foreign and domestic adversaries. When the War of 1812 began, Army strength stood at about one-fifth of its authorized level of 35,603. The State militias were asked to make up the difference and to expand the Military Establishment in the war against England. The Congress requested 30,000 volunteers and 80,000 men

from existing militia units to carry the war to the enemy. With characteristic vigor, thousands of militiamen—our first reservists—responded to the colors. They fought gallantly until the invader was driven from our shores. Who can forget the impressive victory which Jackson won at New Orleans? Many of the troops which battled behind the cotton bales he stacked across the port area of New Orleans were militia soldiers from a cross section of the States of the Union.

The next challenge to American security and independence occurred in 1846. On May 11, 1846, President James Polk sent a message to Congress which stated that "After reiterated menaces, Mexico has passed the boundary of the United States, has invaded our territory, and shed American blood upon the American soil." Congress quickly responded to the President's recommendation to declare war on the Mexican Government because it knew where it could secure the men and military tools to force the aggressors from American territory. It was certain that the State military units would be ready and willing to fight for the honor of the Nation. When General Winfield Scott marched triumphantly into Mexico City, there were hundreds of militiamen among his conquering troops. The citizen-soldier had again displayed the courage and fortitude that had marked his service during the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812.

Again in 1860 the State militia made ready for battle. Now, however, State was divided against State; brother against brother. Instead of joining their strength into an unbeatable combination, Confederate gray opposed Federal Union blue. Both President Abraham Lincoln in the North and President Jefferson Davis in the South appealed to the States under their command for troops to fight for their respective causes. The great Civil War which we commemorate this year was fought in great part by militiamen brought into the service of Confederate and Union Armies. As before, these men on both sides of the fighting lines demonstrated that rare quality of courage and devotion to duty which is the distinguishing characteristic of the citizen-soldier. For 4 painful years, the strength of the Nation was sapped in a bloody contest for noble political objectives. Although the South laid down its arms at Appomattox, it could still hold its honor high. Its brave soldiers had performed well in the cause of the South—no less than the courageous men of blue in the North.

For almost 40 years the Nation tended its wounds suffered in the great battles of the Civil War—at Gettysburg, at Bull Run, and at Antietam. Those wounds healed slowly, but they healed firmly. When the Nation went to war against Spain in 1898, a united Nation joined against the common foe. Yankee and southerner stood shoulder to shoulder against the Spanish Army. Every State of the Union contributed troops. In a very few months, the war was over. The militia system had proven adequate to the task of war.

With the advent of the 20th century, many military officials saw the need for more, not less, reliance on the militia during times of national crisis. To achieve an efficient peacetime establishment, Congress passed the Dick Act in 1903. It was designed "to promote the efficiency of the militia." This act marked a milestone in the development of the militia. The Militia Act of 1792 was now left behind, and the Nation entered the modern era with the development of the National Guard.

The Dick Act provided that the militia was to consist of every male citizen between the ages of 18 and 45, and that they were to be divided into two classes: the Organized Militia to be known as the National Guard of each State or territory, and the Reserve Militia which was to be the remainder of

the manpower pool of the age group. Annual drill, instruction, and target practice were required. The Secretary of War was authorized to issue arms and equipment for the State National Guard units within his charge and to provide facilities for encampment, maneuvers, and field instruction. Inspection of National Guard units was also prescribed and the Secretary of War could detail Regular Army officers for duty with the Organized Militia, subject to revocation by the State Governors. The Dick Act was further strengthened by the National Defense Act of 1916 which provided for Reserve officers and offered more assistance to the States to develop effective guard units. These laws made the National Guard the first line of the Nation's defense. Washington's dream of a well-organized and efficiently administered national militia force had become a reality. In the words of President Woodrow Wilson: "We must depend in every time of national peril, not upon a standing army, but upon a citizenry trained and accustomed to arms."

These words were prophetic. The National Guard now fully supported by the Federal Government, again was equal to the challenge during World War I. Thousands of National Guard men from every corner of America entered their country's service to fight the hated central powers. They distinguished themselves at Chateau Thierry, at St. Mihiel, and at Meuse-Argonne. When the Armistice was declared on November 11, the Nation briefly understood the value of the National Guard once more.

Unfortunately, between 1920 and 1940, the Nation quickly forgot its debt to the National Guard. Public opinion poorly supported the efforts of fighting men in every State of the Union to keep the military strength of the Nation at peak levels through the maintenance of a strong National Guard. Despite years of budgetary famine, many farsighted men gave their energies to the preservation of the guard. The Nation was grateful for their unselfish work in behalf of the guard. National Guard units were the first to fight against the Fascist powers in World War II. Even before America's entry into the war, National Guard men had been activated and deployed in foreign bases throughout the world. They were ready for the Japanese when they landed in the Philippines; they were prepared for the massive Japanese assault against Corregidor. Men like Roger Young of the Ohio National Guard gave their lives so that America could live. Such modern minutemen gave the Nation the time it needed to organize its human and material resources in the crusade for freedom.

Sadly history repeated itself after the Second World War. The Nation quickly demobilized its great military machine composed of over 12 million men and women. Again, farsighted men who saw the necessity for a trained and ready guard were ignored. The postwar era were lean years for the National Guard. Without financial aid or moral comfort, guardsmen continued to train and make themselves ready to defend their Nation in any future conflict. Thank heavens they were not submerged by a complacent public opinion. During the Korean war, the National Guard and Reserve forces formed the basis for a swift remobilization of our Military Establishment.

The American people finally learned their lesson. Today the guard is the most efficient reserve organization in the Nation's history. Note that President Kennedy turned to the guard for help to meet the Berlin crisis as well as the other Communist military threats to the free world's security. Over 75,000 reservists—men who in many instances have already served their country in two wars—have responded with characteristic enthusiasm to the President's plea for aid. These men do not like war,

nor do they honor the killing and wounding of other men. They want peace and justice, and are ready to fight for these goals when the Nation calls upon them.

This army which we dedicate today is a tribute to the millions of guardsmen who have fought to preserve the freedom and independence of the Nation in every war in which the Nation was involved. It is an indication of our firm purpose to stand against the new tyranny which has arisen in Europe and which extends its blood-stained hands across the globe. This army is our answer to the Communist challenge. When freemen combine against tyranny it cannot prevail. The army will prepare men for the fight. It will give them the tools they will need to win the struggle. Let there be no doubt of the outcome. The citizen-soldier will prevail.

Reopening the National Service Life Insurance Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the junior Senator from Louisiana has been making a valiant fight to give World War II and Korean veterans a second chance, for a limited time, to take out national service life insurance. He points out that under what is now generally known as the Long amendment some 16 million veterans could be potential beneficiaries, most of whom were at one time covered, but that these veterans allowed their policies to lapse following separation from service, partly out of ignorance that the program was to be suspended and partly out of economic necessity.

In a recent memorandum the junior Senator from Louisiana described the situation as follows:

The act of April 24, 1951, which terminated the NSLI program, went into effect immediately upon enactment, without giving these veterans any warning that the program was being ended. It had been the intention of an undeterminable number of them to reinstate their insurance at some future time, when their responsibilities and financial ability were more nearly commensurate with doing so. The measure would cost the Government relatively little, since the administrative costs of the new policies would be borne by the new policyholders themselves. The element of Government competition with commercial insurers is negligible; many insurance people feel that reopening the NSLI program for a limited period might well stimulate a hitherto untapped insurance market.

Incidentally, if Members of Congress will briefly review the advantages of Government insurance which they have provided for themselves and other Federal employees, with an added benefit occasioned by their former wartime service, they will find it difficult indeed to subscribe to the argument that veterans, having once failed to take advantage of a Government insurance opportunity, should be forever foreclosed. For a Member of Congress, for example, his period of active military service is added in arriving at retirement benefits. He is not required to pay anything at all for this additional coverage and benefit. Any Member

of Congress who did not take advantage of retirement insurance available to him may pick it up even unto this day.

If it can be regarded as evil for a person to have Government insurance as a result of his connection with the Federal Government, why do we provide so much of it for ourselves? Incidentally, veterans' insurance is less than 1 percent of the volume of Government insurance for death, disability, and retirement benefits.

The foregoing and the many other arguments advanced are very persuasive. And the junior Senator from Louisiana does not stand alone. The other body adopted the Long NSLI amendment five times in the past without a dissenting vote. When added to the bill, H.R. 879, on July 17 of this year, the amendment passed the Senate by a vote of 75 to 0.

Now, I understand that members of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs entertain different views. Mr. Speaker, that does not surprise me at all. I have been a lawyer for 35 years, a State senator, and a Member of this body for quite a spell of time. I have long since found out that except for the Ten Commandments there are usually two sides to every argument.

But to those standing on the side, so to speak, it is difficult to make an intelligent decision until the views of the contending parties are unfolded in debate. In this instance, however, it has not been possible to listen to the usual process of arguments in the House on both sides of the issue. This has been due to an unfortunate impasse of long duration between the two Houses of the Congress.

Without rehashing what took place previously, I think it might serve a useful purpose to say a few words about the action thus far taken in this session concerning the legislative effort on behalf of these veterans.

On June 5, 1961, the House passed a disabled veterans' compensation measure, H.R. 879, and the Senate added the Long NSLI amendment to it. This bill, H.R. 879, as amended by the Senate, has been lying on the Speaker's desk for quite some time.

Some time ago the House also passed the bill, H.R. 856, designed to permit certain veterans who already hold national service life insurance policies to convert them from term to some other forms of life insurance. In addition to adding the Long amendment to H.R. 856, the Senate Finance Committee also added as an amendment the substance of H.R. 879, the disabled veterans' compensation measure above referred to. In fact, the amendment to H.R. 856 contained the same provisions as the original House-passed H.R. 879. The junior Senator from Louisiana points out that the net result was that H.R. 856 as it passed the Senate became something of an omnibus veterans' bill. The provision relating to optional conversion plan for outstanding NSLI policies was amended to include the veterans' pension increase as that proposal had passed the House, as well as the Long NSLI proposal. This broad bill, H.R. 856, has also been lying on the Speaker's desk.

Then, on September 6, the House, rather than acting on H.R. 856 with the

two Senate amendments, or H.R. 879, as amended, suspended the rules and added the substance of the veterans' pension bill, H.R. 879, to the orphans' education bill, S. 2051. Only a very careful reading of the RECORD on that date would reveal that the compensation amendment had been added. It was not labeled as a compensation increase. The fact that the compensation measure had been added was ascertainable only by a close reading of the entirety of the provisions of the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it emphatically clear that I am not being critical of anyone who might disagree with the junior Senator from Louisiana. I am simply outlining the various parliamentary situations which have developed during this session of the Congress with regard to his proposal.

In fact, as indicated, maybe the junior Senator from Louisiana is wrong. And maybe the other body was wrong five times in agreeing with him. But then maybe they are right. The only way to find out would be to bring up the proposal on the floor of the House for consideration and I very much hope that the chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for whom I have the highest regard and warm personal affection, will see fit to reconsider his position and lend his aid in seeing this logjam untangled in a democratic fashion by debating and voting upon each of the several proposals, including the Long NSLI amendment, on their merits. We still have time to resolve these problems during this session of the Congress. Let us bring up the Long amendment, let us debate, and let us vote on it on its merits.

Institute of Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an article from a recent edition of the New York Times, entitled "Wide Scope Urged for Law Schools."

This article cites and describes the proposals of Dean Erwin N. Griswold of the Harvard Law School to establish several institutes of law to conduct research into a broad range of problems.

Dean Griswold referred to the problems of automobile accidents, of crime, of juvenile delinquency, of fair trial, of public service and of standards of the bench and bar. He also advocated establishment of an Institute of Foreign and Comparative Law.

There can be no question but what Dean Griswold's enumeration of certain extremely difficult problems should be carefully considered and acted upon by the Congress.

This Nation prides itself that it operates under the rule of law. Yet our

efforts to improve the functioning of our system, our legal procedures and the development of proper organization and facilities to make the law more meaningful, effective and fair in its various legal, social, and economic aspects would seem to be feeble and unrealistic.

There are two schools of thought regarding the functions of the modern law school, one believing that it should train lawyers for practice, and the other feeling that it should give more attention to research and the training and development of legal teachers and possibly judges. There is logically no reason why our law schools, in the same sense, could not perform both functions.

Dean Griswold has pointed to several fields where, clearly, much research and work need to be done in order to implement programs designed to remedy and improve certain definite shortcomings in meeting the problem of world peace in its legal and procedural aspects, as well as in substantive terms.

For example, little or no emphasis is placed in current international relations upon setting up and utilizing truly justifiable methods of handling disputes between Nations.

All too often, we tend to give lip service rather than heart service to proposals to improve the very vital, judicial, international institutions which should be the real hope of the world for substituting the civilized instruments of argument, debate persuasion and use of legal and equitable principles and procedures for the present haphazard negotiation processes which are practically devoid of suitable guiding principles having to do with providing broader instrumentalities for achieving justice that should be readily available and usable by contending parties.

In this respect, the rule of law which we are supposed to cherish and develop to maximum usefulness is swept to one side in favor of rather superficially prepared and inadequately implemented personal negotiations leaving to individual or group negotiators functions that could best be performed by judicial or quasi-judicial bodies.

The same is true of automobile accidents, crime, juvenile delinquency, fair trial, public service, the standards of bench and bar, and other vital problems to which much study has been given with practically no discernible, organized effort to try to solve these great problems by the development of additional, effective legal and judicial procedures.

Most of these problems relate to social well-being as well as political and economic rights. The question of fair trial is of primary importance as is the question of fair hearing, whether before the courts, administrative bodies or congressional or other official committees.

The Congress is very properly giving great attention to certain medical and health problems designed to enable us to make more effective attack upon killer diseases and other physical, mental, or nervous ailments presently causing untold suffering, premature death, anxiety, and high expense and huge social costs.

As the dean points out, it is important to tackle these problems with some reference to the impact of law upon them and to develop effective instrumentalities for coping with many challenging social and economic conditions which are hampering peace settlements, promoting all kinds of confusion, delay, bewilderment and injustice in our relationships, both national and international.

I hope the Congress will give its attention to this proposal for creating and supporting several institutes of law which has been suggested by Dean Griswold and give encouragement and support, assiduously and comprehensively, in several important fields where some improvement is so strongly indicated.

It is an ironical fact that the Soviet Government, through its Institute of Law of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, is working in these fields and this Nation cannot afford to be behind efforts made anywhere to try to step up the effectiveness of our own rule of law and system of justice.

Admittedly, the Soviet system does not see eye to eye with the free world on basic questions relating to personal liberty of the individual and the general question of freedom.

However, this is all the more reason why we should make sure that our system of justice, that our law schools and other agencies, working in the legal field, should be given every help in developing the new techniques needed to render more effective our entire system of dispensing justice.

I am deeply interested in Dean Griswold's proposals and hope that some program along the lines he suggests can be developed and supported by the Congress:

WIDE SCOPE URGED FOR LAW SCHOOLS—GRISWOLD CALLS FOR INSTITUTES ON SOCIETY'S PROBLEMS

(By Fred M. Hechinger)

Dean Erwin N. Griswold of the Harvard Law School believes that American lawyers have a "restricted and self-centered view" of society's problems.

To counteract this, he has urged in his annual report, several institutes of law should be established in the United States to conduct research into a broad range of problems. He mentioned the maintenance of peace and ways of combating automobile accidents and crime and delinquency.

He also advocated establishment of an Institute of Foreign and Comparative Law, and suggested that the Harvard Law School was well equipped to operate such an institute.

Dean Griswold asserted that by concentrating almost entirely on the teaching of common law, American law schools contributed to what he called the United States isolation from the rest of the world.

LEGAL CENTERS CITED

He noted that a number of law schools "have come to call themselves legal centers."

But he declared that nothing short of institutes of law, doing research comparable to that being conducted in the natural sciences and medicine, could counteract the "great pressures in our law schools today toward a life which is more narrowly oriented."

Dean Griswold said that little was known in this country about Moslem or African law.

He said that this was also true about the law of India, Japan, Indonesia, and China, "particularly Communist China." Even

though contacts may be limited at present, he said, "a university should be planning for the future."

He pointed to the Russian Institute of Law of the Soviet Academy of Sciences as an effort to deal with broader problems.

Last year, Dean Griswold said, the United States spent \$8,400 million for scientific research, including defense research. In the same period he said, about \$840,000 was spent by the Nation's law schools on legal research.

While concentrating on preparing their students for the severely limited number of clerkships in law offices, he charged, the Nation's law schools neglect both the practical needs of society and the student's idealism. Serving private clients, though important, is too much in the forefront of goals in the present American law school, he said.

He said that the problems of automobile accidents, of crime and juvenile delinquency, of fair trial, of public service and of "standards of the bench and bar" were neglected.

"The problems of automobile accidents and of crime are surely as important to society, and no less difficult, than the problem of cancer," Dean Griswold wrote.

He asked whether, in addition to the thousands of persons devoted to the essential maintenance of defense, there should not be "at least a thousand working in and out of the Government in the manifold problems of the maintenance of peace."

H.R. 4333, a Bill To Amend the So-Called Lanham Trademark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased by this opportunity to speak on my bill, H.R. 4333, to amend the so-called Lanham Trademark Act, and I urge its passage today.

This bill represents some 13 years of painstaking effort and experience in conjunction with the administration of the Lanham Act. The bill has wide support throughout the country among trademark owners, lawyers, and associations of the bar including the U.S. Trademark Association, the American Bar Association, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Philadelphia Bar Association, the New York County Lawyers Association, and the Bar Association of the city of New York.

The purpose of this bill is to first, correct various typographical errors that appeared by inadvertence in the present act; second, clarify the meaning of several provisions whose language is inconsistent or obscure; and third, introduce some changes in procedural details that experience has shown to be desirable.

At this point it might be well to relate some of the history of the trademark laws of the United States which led up to the legislation now at hand.

Following the enactment of the Trademark Act of 1946, usually referred to as the Lanham Act, there appeared need for some revision in the statute. That was to be expected as its administration got underway. Work toward necessary revision began in 1948 when a group of lawyers, representing various

bar associations, and the U.S. Trademark Association formed a group which was known as the Coordinating Committee. It consisted of representatives of some 26 associations. This committee held numerous meetings in Washington, Chicago, and New York and achieved substantial agreement on appropriate changes in the law. A bill, including proposed changes, was introduced in the 82d Congress as S. 1957. It became the subject of considerable study and of further suggestions from individuals, associations and Government departments. On July 31, 1953, a bill representing many such suggestions was introduced in the 83d Congress. That was S. 2540, and it was the subject of hearings before the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on March 25, 1954. That bill was passed by the Senate, but no action was taken by the House of Representatives.

S. 215 of the 84th Congress was substantially the same as S. 2540. No action was taken on it.

S. 2429 was introduced in the 86th Congress on July 23, 1959. It was similar to the previous bills but did not cover all of the features contained in them. It was referred to as a "housekeeping bill" and was considered to be substantially noncontroversial. The various Government departments interested in the subject matter of the bill submitted reports of their views and, with the exception of certain technical amendments, there was no objection by the departments. S. 2429 was favorably reported on June 24, 1960. It passed the Senate but no action was taken by the House of Representatives.

My bill, H.R. 4333, is exactly the same as S. 2429 as reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee and passed by the Senate in the 86th Congress. The bill would make numerous amendments to the Trademark Act, none of which is considered to be of a substantive nature.

Subcommittee hearings were held on this measure on August 16th and no substantial objections to the merits of this bill were filed by any of the executive departments concerned. The full Judiciary Committee unanimously ordered this measure to be favorably reported to the House.

At this point I should like to express my appreciation to Mr. James F. Hoge, a distinguished New York attorney, well known in the trademark field. Mr. Hoge served as chairman of the bar association coordinating committee.

Mrs. Daphne Leeds, of Washington, D.C., has also been of enormous assistance to us. Mrs. Leeds is also a distinguished trademarks attorney and has written widely on the subject. She has served as Chief Administrator of the Registration provisions of the Lanham Act.

In conclusion Mr. Speaker, it is the opinion of the proponents of this legislation that the bill does not affect the substantive provisions of the Lanham Act or of the trademark law generally. I realize that the word "substantive" is subject to definition and some possible

disagreement, but the amendments are advocated as being procedural or administrative and corrective. They are commonly referred to as "housekeeping" amendments and they are designed to be just that.

Mount Vernon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a letter which I have today written to the Honorable ALAN BIBLE, Senator from Nevada, and chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, expressing my interest and concern regarding legislation which has been introduced in both bodies which will assure protection for the conservation of the Maryland shore opposite Mount Vernon, the home of George and Martha Washington.

Also included are copies of editorials which have appeared in the Providence Evening Bulletin and the Westerly Sun on this subject, as well as several letters I have received from Rhode Islanders expressing their views on this legislation.

I am certainly hopeful that favorable action will be taken on these measures to protect the national shrine of Mount Vernon before this Congress adjourns:

SEPTEMBER 18, 1961.

HON. ALAN BIBLE,
Chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee,
Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to express to you my deep interest and real concern in pending legislation, House Joint Resolution 459 and Senate Joint Resolution 97, which will assure protection for the conservation of the Maryland shore opposite Mount Vernon, the Home of George and Martha Washington.

As you know, the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources has launched a nationwide campaign in support of these resolutions. I think you will agree with me, as a visitor many times to Mount Vernon, that it would be a shame to allow the obstruction of this view that has been preserved for so many years. I hope that you will do everything you can to have this resolution reported to the Senate and passed at this session of the Congress.

With warmest personal regards,

Sincerely,

JOHN E. FOGARTY,
Member of Congress.

A SEWAGE DISPOSAL PLANT OPPOSITE MOUNT VERNON?

The fight to preserve open space in this country against misguided urban sprawl grows more sharp every day. Seldom are the terms of the conflict stated more clearly than in the struggle to preserve the magnificent vista from Mount Vernon on the Potomac from a further ugly and unnecessary intrusion of urban sprawl.

The immediate issue is a plan to construct a large sewage treatment plant on the

Maryland shore of the river across from Mount Vernon. In itself, such a plant would be a monstrous intrusion on relatively unspoiled countryside. But its construction will open square miles of land to a rash of residential plats.

Pressing for the plant is a group of real estate developers. Now there is nothing wrong with the business of developing real estate to the profit of dealers and, presumably, to the long-term benefit of families which will move into the plats. And certainly, Washington and its satellite communities are growing fast.

But we simply do not believe that the need for housing in the Washington area—the Capital is about 16 miles from the site—is so great that it must be built at the expense of a magnificent national heritage, the vista from Mount Vernon which is as much a glorious part of the shrine as the home itself.

The trouble in the immediate situation is that the developers are pressing for a start on the plant. The Maryland agency involved is the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, and the developers want it to use its power to condemn land to acquire the site opposite Mount Vernon for the sewage treatment plant.

Three bills are pending in Congress to enable the Government to acquire by gift or purchase about 1,180 acres opposite the home and to confirm deed restrictions on an additional 1,410 acres. But unless the bills are passed, there is every chance that a start will be made on the treatment plant.

The fight to get the bills passed is being led by the Mount Vernon Ladies Association of the Union, which has owned Mount Vernon since 1858 and has maintained the structure as an historic shrine, a major target of tourists from all over the world. The association is wholly private, a public service organization.

The association has support, of course, including "sympathetic letters" from the members of the Rhode Island congressional delegation. But it needs the massed support of every American, particularly those who have been to Mount Vernon and know firsthand what damage would be done by the proposed development across the river.

These are difficult days in Washington as Congress tries to clear its docket of business and as the tensions of the cold war tend to distract public attention from issues of lesser size than the Berlin crisis. It is this kind of situation which is tailor-made to the interests of the proponents of the treatment plant.

It is our earnest hope that every Rhode Islander who is concerned with preserving the national heritage will write to members of our congressional delegation, asking them to do whatever they can do in committees and on the floors of both Houses to get action on the three protective bills.

It will be an unhappy day for the Nation if the bills fail even to get to the floor. It is a shameful kind of progress which would destroy a significant part of the national heritage. Can't this Nation preserve from change in the name of "progress" a few hundred acres of land along the Potomac River?

PROVIDENCE, R.I.,
August 11, 1961.

DEAR SIR: One more vote for passage of three bills: for the Government to acquire by gift or purchase 1,180 acres opposite Mount Vernon and to confirm deed restrictions on an additional 1,410 acres.

KATHERINE W. O'LEARY.

CHARM OF MOUNT VERNON ENDANGERED

Gen. George Washington, the first President of the United States, certainly had an

eye for a good view when he acquired the land where Mount Vernon now stands. Located on the Virginia side of the Potomac River below Washington, it overlooks a vast expanse of river frontage and the green hills of Maryland beyond.

Mount Vernon has been preserved by the American people and for the American people as one of the Nation's greatest shrines. A walk around the grounds, among the gardens, and through the mansion itself takes one back to early history-making years of our country. One can just imagine "honest George" and wife Martha, sitting on the wide front veranda enjoying a view unparalleled anywhere.

But this magnificent view—as much a part of Mount Vernon as the grounds themselves—may be doomed, unless the American people wake up to their possible loss and act immediately. A mammoth sewage disposal plant is planned for the opposite shore.

Maryland real estate promoters wish to develop this land into housing units for rapidly growing Washington and all its governmental agencies. This requires a large sewage treatment plant—plunk in the middle of Mount Vernon's view.

While the real estate men are exerting pressure for the purchase and development of this land through the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, there are three bills before Congress to enable the Government to acquire part of this land and restrict deeds on other land opposite Mount Vernon. Involved in either a gift transaction or an outright purchase by the Government are 1,180 acres of land across the Potomac from Mount Vernon. An additional 1,410 acres will have deed restrictions confirmed.

Many national shrines have been preserved throughout the United States. Others, such as Cape Cod, have recently been added to the list of beauty spots of America. Mount Vernon must be preserved with its peaceful charm of the 18th century.

It can be preserved—if all of us do our part. We suggest letters, telegrams, and postal cards to the various Representatives and Senators in Congress—particularly your own from Rhode Island and Connecticut—requesting prompt action on these bills now before Congress. We cannot afford to let the international situation pigeonhole these land purchase measures.

Write to your Representatives and Senators. Do it today.

PROVIDENCE, R.I., August 1, 1961.

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FOGARTY: As vice regent for Rhode Island of the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association, and its former Regent for over 10 years, I am writing to you to urge you to use your influence in all possible ways in support of the resolutions introduced in the Senate (and the House) for the conservation of the Maryland shore opposite Mount Vernon, the home of George and Martha Washington. Senate Joint Resolution 97 (introduced by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Chairman, Senate Interior Committee) and House Joint Resolution 7852 (introduced by Representative WAYNE N. ASPINALL, chairman, House Interior Committee) are shortly I believe to be under subcommittee discussion.

The Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, Dr. Ira Gabrielson, chairman, has launched a nationwide campaign in support of these resolutions.

At present the view from the mansion across the Potomac is uninterrupted and much as it was in General Washington's lifetime.

I beg your support in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

HOPE PEARL HARKNESS,
Mrs. Albert Harkness.

THE RHODE ISLAND

HISTORICAL SOCIETY,
Providence, R.I., August 3, 1961.

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY,
House of Representatives, House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I was shocked to hear that Mount Vernon is threatened by a proposal to construct a huge sewage-treatment plant across the river which could be seen from Mount Vernon and from the parkway approaches to the property. I understand that it would also destroy the archaeological evidence of one of the most important Indian villages in the East.

I hope that you will support House Joint Resolution 459 introduced by Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR and H.R. 7852 introduced by Representative WAYNE N. ASPINALL, chairman of the House Interior Committee.

As director of the Rhode Island Historical Society and as a citizen of the United States I cannot believe that we have come to the place where we cannot protect the property which the ladies of the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association have struggled so long and faithfully to maintain. I know that you will do your best to keep Mount Vernon a spotless shrine.

Very truly yours,

CLIFFORD P. MONAHAN,
Director.

WESTERLY, R.I., September 11, 1961.

Representative FOGARTY, of Rhode Island,
Washington, D.C.:

Please do all you can to prevent a sewage disposal plant opposite our beautiful heritage, Mount Vernon.

Thanking you,

N. H. ANDREWS.

Genocide Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1961

MR. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, on May 25, 1961, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter written by Will Maslow of the American Jewish Congress to the editor of the New York Times. This letter, which appeared in the Times of May 21, 1961, urged the ratification of the Genocide Convention of the United Nations and deplored the fact that while 64 Nations have ratified the convention, the United States has not. I am in full agreement with Mr. Maslow's position.

Genocide has always shocked mankind, but warnings have not been heeded. With the weapons that modern science has placed in our hands, we have come to a time when the ratification of the Genocide Convention is imperative. No longer can we procrastinate. A man sat recently in a glass booth in an Israeli courtroom. Had the booth been a mirror, rather than clear glass, the man could have seen his own reflection and known that the crime of Adolf Eichmann was the crime of mankind. For the first time in history, the means exist to help wipe out the scourge of genocide; the Genocide Convention must be utilized.

On December 11, 1946, the United Nations declared genocide to be a crime

under international law and established the right of intervention in behalf of minorities destined for destruction. The United Nations Resolution No. 96 also called for a "Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide." Although the United States did become a signatory state on December 11, 1948, we still have not deposited any instrument of ratification. The Genocide Convention has been in force since January 12, 1951, 90 days after 20 Nations had either ratified or acceded, as provided by the convention. Since then, 44 other Nations have ratified the convention, including the Soviet Union. The United States now occupies a conspicuously poor position as regards the convention.

Many criticisms have been hurled at the provisions of the convention, but under careful analysis they do not stand up. Perhaps the most frequent criticism concerns the Constitution and the treaty-making powers of Congress. Oliver Schroeder, a faculty member of the Western Reserve University School of Law has done extensive research on this question. He concludes:

The Genocide Convention does satisfy the constitutional requirements as a proper exercise of the treaty-making authority: Its subject matter is international, it does not clash with any specific or fixed provision of our Constitution; it merely redefines the highly flexible boundary between Federal and State jurisdictions * * *; it rests on the judicial and legislative precedents of many decades which permit Federal protection of human rights including security from violence.

He further states:

Article I, section 8, grants constitutional validity to a Federal statute providing for trial and punishment, domestically and internationally, of persons accused of the new world crime of genocide.

It is hoped that Mr. Schroeder's research will allay any fears still lingering concerning the effect of the ratification on our Constitution.

The convention received Executive endorsement when President Truman stated in a letter to the Senate on June 16, 1949:

America has long been a symbol of freedom and democratic progress to peoples less favored than we have been and * * * we must maintain their belief in us by our policies and our acts. By the leading part the United States has taken in the United Nations in producing an effective international legal instrument outlawing the world-shaking crime of genocide, we have established before the world our firm and clear policy toward that crime. By giving its advice and consent to the ratification of this convention, which I urge, the Senate of the United States will demonstrate that the United States is prepared to take effective action on its part to contribute to the establishment of the principles of law and justice.

President Truman has considered in this letter two important points which must be recognized. The first is that the United States took a large part in the drafting of the convention during the United Nations sessions; yet, when it came time to ratify the convention, the United States was conspicuously absent. The second point, and most important, is

that the United States must play a leading role if genocide is to become extinct.

The United States must accept the obligation of taking the lead in furthering principles of freedom and justice. As Dean Rusk, then Deputy Under Secretary of State, said in 1950:

It is an inescapable fact that other nations of the world expect the United States to assert moral leadership in international affairs. The United States has a record of humanitarian diplomacy beginning with the early days of the Republic * * * prevailing international conditions make it imperative that the United States continue to play this role. We all know too well that millions of human beings are still subjected to the domination of ruthless totalitarian regimes, and that the specter of genocide still haunts mankind. It should be made clear to such governments that the United States and other civilized countries do not condone such conduct now any more than in the past.

Rusk's speech is as timely today as it was in 1950.

The ideas of Dean Rusk were also the conclusions of Robert B. Patterson, a member of the U.S. Committee for the United Nations Genocide Convention. He asserts the following principles:

The mass destruction of human beings according to groups on lines of nationality, race, or religion has been an abominable evil, an evil that has shocked the conscience of mankind. That it is of grave international concern because it is the concomitant of aggression against other nations; because it arouses the most deep-seated resentment in members of the group that are

persecuted; and because it causes wholesale dislocations of people and the problems of caring for those people by neighboring states. That it calls for collective action by the family of nations. And that it calls for leadership, moral leadership, on the part of the United States.

Peoples of all religions lend their support to the ratification of the Genocide Convention. Jacob Blaustein, president of the American Jewish Committee testified in 1950:

First, and dwarfing all other considerations, is the fact that genocide is the most appalling crime in all recorded history. It was practiced in centuries prior to the recent excesses of the Nazis, and can occur again. Second, genocide destroys economic, cultural, and spiritual values and debases mankind. Third, genocide is a threat to the peace of the world. Fourth, the present convention, when ratified, will serve as an effective deterrent. Fifth, the Genocide Convention not only fills a gap in international law, but is fully consistent with international legal precedent and with American constitutional principles. Sixth, there is need for prompt U.S. action on this question in order to discharge our responsibilities as the foremost advocate of international morality.

The Catholic Association for International Peace endorsed ratification saying:

The position which the United States holds in the world affairs today, and in particular our belief in the good and the right, obliges us to take whatever steps we can in the defense of humanity. This occasion to ratify a convention on the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide is a unique

opportunity for us to act upon the principles by which we claim to live.

At the same time the Provincial Elders Conference, executive board of the Moravian Church in America, stated:

We further believe it is the duty of the United States to take the lead wherever possible in upholding the highest ethical and moral standards for national and international conduct.

The labor movement also came out for the ratification of the Genocide Convention. In a letter to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in 1950, James Carey, then secretary-treasurer of the CIO wrote:

Mass destruction of national, racial, and/or religious groups shakes the conscience of mankind and inflicts great loss on humanity. Labor suffers from this crime whether it is inflicted by Nazi, Communist, or Fascist regimes. The term applied to these sufferings is genocide. We have urged and shall continue to urge Senate approval of the Genocide Convention adopted by the United Nations General Assembly.

It is difficult to contemplate something so shocking as the crime of genocide. Genocide grows like a poisonous fungus, pulling man down to the level of mere animals. God has endowed man with the ability to think; but it is man's responsibility to use this gift. We cannot shirk our responsibility; we must use it to destroy a blight which casts a shadow on the face of mankind. I urge each Member of this body and each citizen of the United States to give careful consideration to this most urgent matter.

SENATE

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 1961

(Legislative day of Saturday, September 16, 1961)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, with soiled faces and hands unclean with the dust of earthly toil, in this moment of communion with the unseen and the eternal, we would come to the still waters of Thy restoring grace.

As those set aside to prescribe for the ills of an ailing social order, we pray that Thou wilt first cleanse our own souls from moral pollution and that Thou wilt dispel our mental darkness.

In a world where the worst wars constantly against the best, open our eyes to the invisible allies which fight by the side of those who keep step with the drumbeat of Thy will—invincible forces which at last will bend and break the spears of evil.

When the sadness of the world creeps into our own eyes, and we are plagued with our own inadequacies in these baffling times, stand out in splendor before us like the light, like love all lovely, like the morning which slays the shadows.

We ask it in the name of that One whose life is the light of the world. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, September 18, 1961, was approved without reading.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5968) to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment

Compensation Act, as amended; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS, of Georgia, Mr. ST. GERMAIN, Mr. KEARNS, and Mr. BROYHILL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 8072. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 8666. An act to provide for the improvement and strengthening of the international relations of the United States by promoting better understanding among the peoples of the world through educational and cultural exchanges.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF JOINT SESSION ON THURSDAY TO HEAR ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT OF PERU

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I announce that on Thursday, September 21, there will be a joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress to hear an address